**MrMcclaughry**
4 hours ago

To Dana Whitmire @rottingjewels -

In your video Scientology's Legacy of Secrets: The Community "Speaks" (Doug Kramer Deserved Better) streamed October 21 2025 -

At 2:59:26 you stated: "So don't [ __ ] with me. And if ANY OF THE INDIVIDUALS THAT I HAVE SHOWN TODAY continue to [ __ ] with me, please be aware all communications are in a drive ready to go and they will be published unredacted in full if you [ __ ] with me."

https://www.youtube.com/live/0WuQUAzM...

Right at the beginning of this same video you attacked my wife regarding a post I featured for a time here (concerning Doug Kramer). One of the things you did in this same video is that you used her post as an excuse to breach confidentiality of private text communications between she and you.

That same post is what you characterized in your October 21 2025 video as my wife "[ __ ] with" you, since she was the first of the individuals that you de-marked in your video as "individuals that I have shown today".

Since my wife was one of those "individuals", then the next thing you said applied to her: "please be aware all communications are in a drive ready to go

Since my wife was one of those "individuals", then the next thing you said applied to her: "please be aware all communications are in a drive ready to go and they will be published unredacted in full if you [ __ ] with me."

You also said earlier, at 2:59:09 "All you're going to do is make me mad.
And I think I've made it quite clear that I'm happy to uh just lay it all out
here if I'm mad. So don't [ __ ] with me."

Dana, you just made a record of yourself trying to extort/blackmail my wife into silence by threatening her with breaching the confidentiality of "all communications" if she writes or says anything at all about you, your research (videos/podcasts etc.) - that you opine as " [ __ ] with" you - defined by you as makes you mad.

Care to explain here the real reason(s) why you are choosing to engage in crimes like extortion/blackmail towards my family?

It doesn't seem to be a very good solution for whatever problem you're having.

Mike McClaughry

1

MrMcclaughry
2.2K subscribers

SUBSCRIBE

# Replies

@diannetex • 7h ago

I'm unsure why she keeps making videos about Doug. A person she didn't even know.Yet, she's telling friends who've personally known him 10+ years to f off. Dana popped up 2 years ago. She looks goofier than hell making these videos. Like any of us care if she approves of us or not 😟

Shortly before Doug's death- She was posting screenshots of Doug texting her. He was simply asking her about a possible video collab about The Process Church. She posted his texts to make it appear like Doug was seggsually harassing her. So her lover ZDT would come & protect her from all of the "bad" ex- Scio guys.

It's unfortunate. If she treated Doug respectfully instead of backstabbing him for attention- She could have done a great collab with him. Her loss.

The irony is, she is the epitome of what Doug and I used to refer to as "Cult Groupies"

We've all tried being kind & helpful to Dana. She's done nothing but bash all of us for zero reason. Then cry about how she can't stand any of us.

She's a complete stranger who doesn't know us. Yet is obsessed with whining about us. It's odd.

You'd think that someone who's trying to be Queen Cult Groupie wouldn't be scared to correspond with us.

I wanted to tell Virginia that Dana is going to use her for info. If I said anything, it would've seem like I'm being an instigator. We all gotta get backstabbed 1st hand to learn who the psycho cult groupies are. That's why I never associate with them. Cult groupies view us as a freak show. There's no being friends with them.

If she's reading this- Dana- Get a reality check. We don't need affirmation or acceptance from you. Please sit down.

2

In your video Scientology's Legacy of Secrets: The Community "Speaks" (Doug Kramer Deserved

## Replies

@MrMcclaughry · 2h ago (edited)

This is Virginia using my husband's account - - -

@diannetex. I don't know if it's possible in the comments here at youtube community, but could you please provide the link(s) to where Dana was "posting screenshots of Doug texting her" that also shows Dana characterizing them as "seggsually harassing her", as well as any public evidence where Doug ever talked about "Cult Groupies"?

We prefer direct evidence here where possible. Otherwise it's little more than opinions.

There is something called hearsay though, and I have seen it happen where opinions are actually really fabrications of first hand knowledge - a classic example is what Nora Sova Ames Crest does in regards to what her father Con Sova did or didn't do working for Mike as Mike's asset in the Guardian office. When that kind of Fabrication/Hearsay is deliberately used to hide the truth (particularly an unpalatable one to the hearsay-er) - as well as try to get others not to look and to view someone in a particular way as part of hiding that truth, things get a whole lot darker. In some cases, things start straying heavily into old-guard-invented intelligence actions.

I know for a fact Doug was complimentary of some of Dana's work, just found out about that recently. (I will be providing Mike with that documentation one of these days). That live and on video statement by Doug does tend to raise a conflict with what you are opining here about [redacted] Dana. I'm not

I know for a fact Doug was complimentary of some of Dana's work, just found out about that recently. (I will be providing Mike with that documentation one of these days). That live and on video statement by Doug does tend to raise a conflict with what you are opining here about how he may have viewed Dana. I'm not against the idea particularly, but it's not the kind of thing I would just take on faith.

This is why I also think that I should clarify something else, which is that while Mike and I will defend ourselves against people that lie about us or try to threaten us into silence, like Dana did (documented in this post) that doesn't automatically equal that we are on-board with platforming anything and everything someone wants to say about Dana. They can exercise that choice on their own community page if that's their idea of free speech.

I hope you understand and thank you for listening.

Notes -

Not legal advice but this is what Google's AI had to say about the idea of someone who wasn't even born yet, like Nora, trying to challenge Mike's firsthand testimony re: her father Con Sova - how that's viewed as to her truthfulness/credibility.

Quote:

*No Personal Knowledge: A person not yet born at the time of an event could not possibly have firsthand knowledge of it.

*Fabrication: "Inventing" something about an event suggests fabrication or speculation, which is not considered reliable evidence.

*Admissibility: Any testimony from this person about the event, if they were repeating information they heard from others, would be hearsay (second-hand information). If they were simply making things up, it

that choice on their own community page if that's their idea of free speech.

I hope you understand and thank you for listening.

Notes -

Not legal advice but this is what Google's AI had to say about the idea of someone who wasn't even born yet, like Nora, trying to challenge Mike's firsthand testimony re: her father Con Sova - how that's viewed as to her truthfulness/credibility.

Quote:

*No Personal Knowledge: A person not yet born at the time of an event could not possibly have firsthand knowledge of it.

*Fabrication: "Inventing" something about an event suggests fabrication or speculation, which is not considered reliable evidence.

*Admissibility: Any testimony from this person about the event, if they were repeating information they heard from others, would be hearsay (second-hand information). If they were simply making things up, it would be false testimony. In either case, it would not be admitted as credible evidence in a court of law.

In summary, direct, firsthand testimony is a valid form of evidence, while fabricated or second-hand accounts from someone who was not present are not.

End Quote.

@lorenspethman4486 • 1h ago

Does "Please sit down" mean " in any way intending to silence the person told to sit down. I may know little ... at least I believe I know little about the intricacy of what goes on in [redacted] I do... Read more

@lorenspethman4486 • 1h ago

Does "Please sit down" mean " in any way intending to silence the person told to sit down. I may know little ... at least I believe I know little about the intricacy of what goes on in all these communities that I don't belong, but I believe I know when someone is attempting to silence another. I have been told to be silent about Nora by Nora ... to never use her name. I don't respond well to people attempting to silence other in their own space. I was lied to by Nora, and she lost any respect for the truth when she comes into my space and tries to strong arm a silence from me about things that truthfully, she has no more direct knowledge about than I do. What do you care about videos being made about Doug. Knowing someone for over 10 + years doesn't qualify you to silence anyone who knows someone less time. The logic is deplorable. You do care or you wouldn't be telling Dana to get a reality check. Whoever "we" are I don't know, but whomever those that consider you can speak for them as if you just wish to slander without giving any verifiable anything other than your opinion/s. I would be willing to consider something more inspectable than what I can't get any better viewpoint than someone else thought about how they think someone shouldn't speak if you think they look goofy. That kind of logic just make me think what is being avoided is being avoided for a reason and the whole misdirection as to what is possibly trying to be silence ... and Dana is not silencing. Dana is no more guilty of being loose with verifiable fact than most other that speak up ... like your comment here giving your view as to why Dana should avoid addressing Doug and his now absence. In bad taste and I don't care how goofy you look or don't look.

Nora avoided the verifiable facts at my FB thread. You wish to misdirect reader here, that you aren't trying to help Dana with anything but to butt out of what you seem to think is your business and no one else need apply unless meets your approval ... life doesn't work that way unless you practice and are skilled at bullying other to get your way. Doug isn't your property, or his

care or you wouldn't be telling Dana to get a reality check. Whoever "we" are I don't know, but whomever those that consider you can speak for them as if you just wish to slander without giving any verifiable anything other than your opinion/s. I would be willing to consider something more inspectable than what I can't get any better viewpoint than someone else thought about how they think someone shouldn't speak if you think they look goofy. That kind of logic just make me think what is being avoided is being avoided for a reason and the whole misdirection as to what is possibly trying to be silence ... and Dana is not silencing. Dana is no more guilty of being loose with verifiable fact than most other that speak up ... like your comment here giving your view as to why Dana should avoid addressing Doug and his now absence. In bad taste and I don't care how goofy you look or don't look.

Nora avoided the verifiable facts at my FB thread. You wish to misdirect reader here, that you aren't trying to help Dana with anything but to butt out of what you seem to think is your business and no one else need apply unless meets your approval ... life doesn't work that way unless you practice and are skilled at bullying other to get your way. Doug isn't your property, or his life isn't for you to determine who should and shouldn't discuss events of his life ... and the ending thereof. This is how I see what you are doing here, and you are welcome to bring something that prove any of this wrong and I will remove/retract when something other your ire for Dana and others who speak of subject that you don't wish them to discuss. Like Atack supporting Jolly West a civil right advocate and a patriot ...etc. ... the scene is bigger than Doug and Doug unfortunately isn't here to give his opinion. So, sticking with something verifiable other than "She looks goofier than hell making these videos." would be in order.